Bob -

Thanks for your recent call expressing concern and asking for clarification regarding the message from Lori that "any management discussion of the project extending beyond 2010 related to events and circumstances that related in large measure to failures by the LWG".

First, I'd like to clarify that, as stated in Lori's message, I do not support the use of the June 2006 Discussion paper on schedule for any purpose beyond RI/FS manager and senior manager discussions. Also, while the 2010 ROD date reflects EPA's current outlook for finalizing the harbor-wide RI/FS, we have had several EPA./LWG project management discussions about being in a better position to modify the overall schedule following submittal of the Round 2 Report and scoping of the Round 3 data gaps.

The schedule projections, which were developed by the EPA and LWG project management team, showed a range of target dates for the major project milestones based on various assumptions. At that time, we agreed that the goal was to manage the project to meet the 2010 schedule and look for opportunities to do better. From my perspective, while managment discussion of delays beyond 2010 included some factors that would be attributable to the quality/timely delivery of LWG products, there were several other factors that were also considered. The 2012 alternative schedule assumptions captured our collective thoughts on a variety of factors that could cause delays, including submittal of poor quality documents, an expanded scale and scope of sampling for data gaps, slow data turnaround from labs, additional review/response and negotiation time, and administrative processes for the proposed plan and ROD. In any case, EPA considers the projected schedules to be preliminary and for internal discussion only at this point.

Chip